ADEQ Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

DRAFT FACT SHEET

ARIZONA POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (AZPDES)

This document gives pertinent information concerning the reissuance of the AZPDES permit listed below. This facility is a wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) with a design capacity of 3.5 million gallons per day (mgd) and thus is considered to be a major facility under the NPDES program. The effluent limitations contained in this permit will maintain the Water Quality Standards listed in Arizona Administrative Code (A.A.C.) R18-11-101 et. seq. This permit is proposed to be issued for a period of 5 years.

Permittee's Name:	City of Buckeye
Permittee's Mailing Address:	423 Arizona Eastern Avenue Buckeye, Arizona 85326
Facility Name:	Sundance Water Reclamation Facility (WRF)
Facility Address or Location:	21760 W. Watkins Street Buckeye, Arizona 85326
County:	Maricopa County
Contact Person(s): Phone/e-mail address	Mr. Jason Battern, Water Resources Operator III (623) 349-6800 / jbattern@buckeyeaz.gov
AZPDES Permit Number:	AZ0024881
Inventory Number:	105022
LTF Number:	73342

I. STATUS OF PERMIT(s)	
AZPDES permit applied for:	Renewal
Date application received:	**August 28, 2018**
Date application was determined administratively complete:	October 17, 2018
Previous permit number (if different):	N/A
Previous permit expiration date:	February 13, 2019

208 Consistency:

In accordance with A.A.C. R18-9-A903(6), a permit cannot be issued for any discharge inconsistent with a plan or plan amendment approved under section 208(b) of the Clean Water Act.

Based on review of the application, there are no changes to the facility that require a new determination of consistency with the Regional Water Quality Management Plan.

City of Buckeye has the following permits issued by ADEQ applicable to the Sundance Water Reclamation Facility (WRF):

Type of Permit	Permit Number	Purpose
Aquifer Protection Permit (APP)	P 105022	Regulates discharges to the local aquifer
Reuse Permit	R 511735	Regulates the practice of reusing treated wastewater for beneficial purposes
Multi-Sector General Permit (MSGP)	AZNC-71103	Regulates stormwater discharge

II. GENERAL FACILITY INFORMATION	
Type of Facility:	Publicly owned treatment works (POTW)
Facility Location Description:	Sundance WRF is located at the northeast corner of South Dean Road and West Watkins Street in the City of Buckeye
Permitted Design Flow:	3.5 million gallons per day (mgd)
Constructed Design Flow:	3.5 million gallons per day (mgd)
Treatment level (WWTP):	Tertiary treatment level
Treatment Processes (include sludge handling and disposal/use):	Treatment processes at the WRF consists of influent screening, grit removal, activated sludge biological treatment, sequential batch reactor technology, with denitrification, tertiary filtration, and ultraviolet (UV) disinfection. The facility may also use chlorine as a backup source for disinfection. Sludge is treated in aerobic digester before de-watering on-site and then hauled and disposed of at Southwest Regional Landfill in Buckeye, Arizona.
Nature of facility discharge:	Domestic wastewater from residential and commercial sources in Buckeye.
Number of industrial dischargers:	None

Number of significant industrial dischargers (SIUs):	None
Average flow per discharge:	The applicant indicates that the average daily discharge flow through outfalls is 0.719 mgd.
Service Area:	Serves the community of Sundance in the City of Buckeye
Service Population:	Approximately 30,000 people
Reuse / irrigation or other disposal method(s):	Treated effluent from the Sundance WRF is primarily reused for irrigation purposes at the Sundance Golf Course. Discharge to the Buckeye and Roosevelt Irrigation District Canals occur when the lake at the golf course is full. The proposed AZPDES permit will re-authorize discharge of treated effluent to the BID and RID Canals.
Continuous or intermittent discharge:	Continuous discharge - Discharge flow records submitted during the existing permit term indicated continuous discharge from the facility. Based on the application, an average daily discharge flow through outfall 001 and 002 is 0.719 mgd.

III. RECEIVING WATER

The State of Arizona has adopted water quality standards to protect the designated uses of its surface waters. Streams have been divided into segments and designated uses assigned to these segments. The water quality standards vary by designated use depending on the level of protection required to maintain that use.

Receiving Water :	Phoenix area canals below municipal WTP intakes and all other locations.
River Basin:	Middle Gila River Basin
Outfall Location(s):	Outfall 001: Township 1 N, Range 3 W, Section 35 Latitude 33˚ 23’ 23” N , Longitude 112˚ 31’ 18” W Outfall 002: Township 1 N, Range 3 W, Section 13 Latitude 33˚ 25’ 26.751” N , Longitude 112˚ 31’ 4.795” W

The outfall discharges to, or the discharge may reach, a surface water listed in Appendix B of A.A.C. Title 18, Chapter 11, Article 1.

Designated uses for the receiving water listed above:	Agricultural Irrigation (AgI) Agricultural Livestock watering (AgL)

Is the receiving water on the 303(d) list?	The Buckeye Irrigation District Canal, which is the receiving water of Outfall 001 is not listed on the 303(d) list. However, this facility has been assigned a waste load allocation (WLA) in the Gila River TMDL that was approved in December 23, 2015 for boron and selenium impairments. The Buckeye Irrigation District Canal and Roosevelt Irrigation District Canal are tributaries of the Hassayampa River. The Hassayampa River is located approximately 15 miles downstream from the discharge points. This Segment of the Hassayampa River was previously listed as impaired for DDT, Metabolities, Toxaphene and Chlordane in fish tissue. On August 7, 2015, the EPA approved the delisting of these impairments.
Given the uses stated above, the applicable narrative water quality standards are described in A.A.C. R18-11-108, and the applicable numeric water quality standards are listed in A.A.C. R18-11-109 and in Appendix A thereof. There are two standards for the Aquatic and Wildlife uses, acute and chronic. In developing AZPDES permits, the standards for all applicable designated uses are compared and limits that will protect for all applicable designated uses are developed based on the standards.	

IV. DESCRIPTION OF DISCHARGE

This facility is in operation and discharges have occurred, effluent monitoring data are available. The following is the measured effluent quality reported in the application.

Parameters	Units	Maximum Daily Discharge Concentration
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (BOD)	mg/L	10.3
Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	mg/L	< 10
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN)	mg/L	8.57
E. coli	MPN / 100 mL	13.4

Facility design removal rates:	BOD 97 % TSS 97 % N 85 %

V. STATUS OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE EXISTING AZPDES PERMIT	
This is a renewal permit for a facility that has been built.	
Date of most recent inspection:	May 10, 2017; Potential deficiencies regarding flow meter, and exceedance of discharge limit of Total Recoverable Boron were noted as a result of this inspection.
DMR files reviewed:	March 2014 through August 2018
Lab reports reviewed:	March 2014 through August 2018
DMR Exceedances:	Boron (May 2016) No other exceedances were noted.
NOVs issued:	Notice of Violation was issued on August 21, 2018 for a failure to submit a renewal application 180 days before the existing permit expires
NOVs closed:	September 21, 2018
Compliance orders:	None

VI. PROPOSED PERMIT CHANGES

The following table lists the major changes from the previous permit in this draft permit.

Parameter	Existing Permit	Proposed permit	Reason for change
Reporting Location	Mail in hard copies of DMRs and other attachments	DMRs and other reports to be submitted electronically through myDEQ portal	Language added to support the NPDES electronic DMR reporting rule that became effective on December 21, 2015.
Boron and Selenium	The Middle Gila River TMDL was not applied in the permit	WLAs for boron and selenium per the 2015 Gila River TMDL were applied to the permit	Monitoring required with assigned WLAs to outfall 001 based on the December 23, 2015 Gila River TMDL.

Anti-backsliding considerations – “Anti-backsliding” refers to statutory (Section 402(o) of the Clean Water Act) and regulatory (40 CFR 122.44(l)) requirements that prohibit the renewal, reissuance, or modification of an existing NPDES permit that contains effluent limits, permit conditions, or standards that are less stringent than those established in the previous permit. The rules and statutes do identify exceptions to these circumstances where backsliding is acceptable. This permit has been reviewed and drafted with consideration of anti-backsliding concerns.

No limits have been removed from the permit. Limits are retained in the draft permit for parameters where reasonable potential (RP) for an exceedance of a standard continues to exist or is indeterminate. In these cases, limits will be recalculated using the most current Arizona Water Quality Standards (WQS). If less stringent limits result due to a change in the WQS then backsliding is allowed in accordance with 303(d)(4) if the new limits are consistent with antidegradation requirements and the receiving water is in attainment of the new standard; see Section XII for information regarding antidegradation requirements.

No limits are less stringent due to a change in the WQS in this permit.

VII. DETERMINATION OF EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS and ASSESSMENT LEVELS

When determining what parameters need monitoring and/or limits included in the draft permit, both technology-based and water quality-based criteria were compared and the more stringent criteria applied.

Technology-based Limitations: As outlined in 40 CFR Part 133:
The regulations found at 40 CFR §133 require that POTWs achieve specified treatment standards for BOD, TSS, and pH based on the type of treatment technology available. Therefore, technology-based effluent limitations (TBELs) have been established in the permit for these parameters. Additionally, oil & grease will be monitored with a TBEL based on best professional judgment (BPJ). The average monthly limit of 10 mg/L and daily maximum of 15 mg/L are commonly accepted values that can be achieved by properly operated and maintained WWTPs. This level is also considered protective of the narrative standard at A.A.C. R18-11-108(B).

In addition, *E. Coli* and total residual chlorine (TRC) will also be monitored with TBELs based on best professional judgment (BPJ). These parameters have been shown through extensive monitoring of the WWTPs to fluctuate greatly and thus are not conducive to exclusion from limitation due to a lack of RP due to no applicable numeric WQS. There, the draft permit contains TBELs for *E. Coli* and TRC.

Numeric Water Quality Standards: As outlined in A.A.C. R18-11-109 and Appendix A:
Per 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(ii), (iii) and (iv), discharge limits must be included in the permit for parameters with "reasonable potential" (RP), that is, those known to be or expected to be present in the effluent at a level that could potentially cause any applicable numeric water quality standard to be exceeded. RP refers to the possibility, based on the statistical calculations using the data submitted, or consideration of other factors to determine whether the discharge may exceed the Water Quality Standards. The procedures used to determine RP are outlined in the *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control (TSD)* (EPA/505/2-90-001). In most cases, the highest reported value for a parameter is multiplied by a factor (determined from the variability of the data and number of samples) to determine a "highest estimated value". This value is then compared to the lowest applicable Water Quality Standard for the receiving water. If the value is greater than the standard, RP exists and a water quality-based effluent limitation (WQBEL) is required in the permit for that parameter. RP may also be determined from BPJ based on knowledge of the treatment facilities and other factors. The basis for the RP determination for each parameter with a WQBEL is shown in the table below.

The proposed permit limits were established using a methodology developed by EPA. Long Term Averages (LTA) were calculated for each designated use and the lowest LTA was used to calculate the average monthly limit (AML) and maximum daily limit (MDL) necessary to protect all uses. This methodology takes into account criteria, effluent variability, and the number of observations taken to determine compliance with the limit and is described in Chapter 5 of the TSD. Limits based on A&W criteria were developed using the "two-value steady state wasteload allocation" described on page 99 of the TSD. When the limit is based on human health criteria, the monthly average was set at the level of the applicable standard and a daily maximum limit was determined as specified in Section 5.4.4 of the TSD.

Total Mass Daily Loads / Waste Load Allocations:
A TMDL for total boron and selenium impairments on the Gila River between Centennial Wash and Gillespie Dam was approved by the EPA on December 23, 2015. The TMDL resulted in setting waste load allocations (WLAs) for boron and selenium concentrations to Outfall 001 that discharges to the Buckeye Irrigation District Canal. The TMDL listed the WLAS for of these parameters as average monthly and daily limit concentrations. The WLAs assigned apply to outfall 001 and were set as limits in the permit.

Mixing Zone: The limits in this permit were determined without the use of a mixing zone. Arizona state water quality rules require that water quality standards be achieved without mixing zones unless the permittee applies for and is approved for a mixing zone. Since a mixing zone was not applied for or granted, all water quality criteria are applied at end-of-pipe.

Assessment Levels (ALs): No assessment levels (ALs) are established in the draft permit. An AL differs from a discharge limit in that an exceedance of an AL is not a permit violation. Instead, ALs serve as triggers, alerting the permitting authority when there is cause for re-evaluation of RP for exceeding a water quality standard, which may result in new permit limitations. The AL numeric values also serve to advise the permittee of the analytical sensitivity needed for meaningful data collection. Trace substance monitoring is required when there is uncertain RP (based on non-detect values or limited datasets) or a need to collect additional data or monitor treatment efficacy on some minimal basis. A reopener clause is included in the draft permit should future monitoring data indicate water quality standards are being exceeded.

Based on BPJ, the following trace substances were not included in the draft permit due to a lack of numeric standards for these pollutants RP based on best professional judgment (BPJ): barium, nitrates, nitrites, and manganese.

Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET): ADEQ no longer requires WET testing if the receiving water has no aquatic and wildlife designated uses. Although the narrative standard prohibiting the discharge of toxic pollutants applies to all discharges, the test species are not appropriate for these receiving waters and no alternative tests are readily available. Therefore, WET testing is not required in this permit, and Part IV for WET testing is shown as "not applicable."

Effluent Characterization (EC): In addition to monitoring for parameters assigned a permit limit, sampling is required to assess the presence of pollutants in the discharge at certain minimum frequencies for additional suites of parameters, whether the facility is discharging or not. This monitoring is specified in Tables 2.a. through 2.e., Effluent Characterization Testing, as follows:

- Table 2.a. – General Chemistry and Microbiology: ammonia, BOD-5, E. coli, total residual chlorine (TRC), dissolved oxygen, total Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN), nitrate/nitrite, oil and grease, pH, phosphorus, temperature, total dissolved solids (TDS), and total suspended solids (TSS)
- Table 2.b. – Selected Metals, Hardness, and Cyanide
- Table 2.c. – Selected Volatile Organic Compounds
- Table 2.d. – Selected Base-Neutral Compounds
- Table 2.e. – Additional Parameters Based on Designated Uses (from Arizona Surface Water Quality Standards, Appendix A, Table 1)

NOTE: Some parameters listed in Tables 2.a. and 2.b. are also listed in Table 1. In this case, the data from monitoring under Tables 1 may be used to satisfy the requirements of Tables 2.a. and / or 2.b., provided the specified sample types are the same. In the event the facility does not discharge to a water of the U.S. during the life of the permit, EC monitoring of representative samples of the effluent is still required. The purpose of EC monitoring is to characterize the effluent and determine if the parameters of concern are present in the discharge and at what levels. This monitoring will be used to assess RP per 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(iii)). EC monitoring is required in accordance with 40 CFR 122.43(a), 40 CFR 122.44(i), and 40 CFR 122.48(b) as well as A.R.S. §49-203(A)(7). If pollutants are noted at levels of concern during the permit term, this permit may also be reopened to add related limits or conditions.

Permit Limitations and Monitoring Requirements:

The table that follows summarizes the parameters that are limited in the permit and the rationale for that decision. Also included are the parameters that require monitoring without any limitations or that have not been included in the permit at all and the basis for those decisions. The corresponding monitoring requirements are shown for each parameter. In general, the regulatory basis for monitoring requirements is per 40 CFR §122.44(i) *Monitoring requirements,* and 40 CFR §122.48(b), *Required monitoring*; all of which have been adopted by reference in A.A.C. R18-9-A905, *AZPDES Program Standards*.

Parameter	Lowest Standard / Designated Use	Maximum Reported Daily Value	No. of Samples	Estimated Maximum Value	RP Determination	Proposed Monitoring Requirement/ Rationale (1)
Flow	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	- - -	Discharge flow is to be monitored on a continual basis using a flow meter.
Biological Oxygen Demand (BOD) and Total Suspended Solids (TSS)	30 mg/L 30-day average 45 mg/L 7-day average/ Technology-based limits 40 CFR 133.102	BOD: 10.3 mg/L TSS: 10 mg/L	BOD: 55 TSS: 52	N/A	TBELs for BOD and TSS are always applicable to WWTPs.	Monitoring for influent and effluent BOD and TSS to be conducted using composite samples of the influent and the effluent. The sample type required was chosen to be representative of the discharge. The requirement to monitor influent BOD and suspended solids is included to assess compliance with the 85% removal requirement in this permit. At least one sample must coincide with WET testing to aid in the determination of the cause of toxicity, if toxicity is detected.
Chlorine, Total Residual (TRC)	TBELs included based on BPJ. Properly operated and maintained WWTPs are capable of meeting a standard of 11 µg/L	No Data	0	N/A	RP always expected when chlorine or bromine is used for disinfection.	TRC is to be monitored as a discrete sample and a WQBEL remains in the permit. 40 CFR Part 136 specifies that discrete samples must be collected for chlorine.
E. coli	TBELs included based on BPJ. Properly operated and maintained WWTPs are capable of meeting the limit. 30-day geometric mean: 126 cfu /100 mL (4 sample minimum) Single sample maximum: 575 cfu /100 mL/ PBC	13.4 MPN / 100ml	66	N/A	RP always expected for WWTPs. See explanation above.	*E. coli* is to be monitored as a discrete sample and a WQBEL remains in the permit.
pH	Minimum: 6.5 S. U. (AgL) Maximum: 9.0 S. U. (AgI and AgL) A.A.C. R18-11-109(B)	Minimum: 6.43 S. U. Maximum: 7.47 S. U	365	N/A	WQBEL is always included. Technology based standard exists in addition to the numeric WQS in A.A.C. R18-11-109(B).	pH is to be monitored using a discrete sample of the effluent and a WQBEL is set. 40 CFR Part 136 specifies that grab samples must be collected for pH. pH sampling must also coincide with ammonia sampling when required.
Temperature	No applicable numeric standard	Oct. – Mar. 33.2°C Apr. – Sep. 34.3°C	365	N/A	N/A	Effluent temperature is to be monitored for effluent characterization by discrete sample. 40 CFR Part 136 specifies that discrete samples must be collected for temperature. Temperature sampling must also coincide with ammonia sampling when required.

Parameter	Lowest Standard / Designated Use	Maximum Reported Daily Value	No. of Samples	Estimated Maximum Value	RP Determination	Proposed Monitoring Requirement/ Rationale (1)
Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)	No applicable standard	1,000 mg/L	18	N/A	N/A	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Ammonia	No applicable standard	4.76 mg/L	7	N/A	N/A	Monitoring required for effluent characterization by discrete sample.
Nutrients (Total Nitrogen and Total Phosphorus)	No applicable standard	N: 0.047 µg/L P: 6.83 µg/L	N: 248 P: 23	N/A	N/A	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Oil & Grease	TBELs included based on BPJ. Narrative standard A.A.C. R18-11-108(B).	< 6.41 mg/L	5	N/A	N/A	Monitoring required and a limit remains in the permit based on BPJ.
Arsenic	200 µg/L / AgL	41.5 µg/L	23	91.3 µg/L	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Boron	**Outfall 001– TMDL WLAs** AVG Monthly Limit – 1000 µg/L Daily Max Limit – 1459 µg/L **Outfall 002** 1,000 µg/L	1,390 µg/L	97	1,946 µg/L	**Outfall 001 – TMDL WLAs** NA – WLAs set **Outfall 002** RP Exists	Monitoring required and a WQBEL remains in the permit for outfalls 002. The TMDL WLAs are set for Outfall 001.
Cadmium	50 µg/L / AgI & AgL	< 2 µg/L	23	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Chromium (Total)	1,000 µg/L / AgI & AgL	22.3 µg/L	23	49.06 µg/L	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Copper	500 µg/L / AgL	32.4 µg/L	12	90.7 µg/L	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Cyanide	200 µg/L / AgL	< 50 µg/L	23	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Hardness	No applicable standard	392 mg/L	10	N/A	N/A	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Lead	100 µg/L / AgL	7.07 µg/L	23	15.6 µg/L	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.
Mercury	10 µg/L / AgL	< 2 µg/L	20	N/A	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.

Parameter	Lowest Standard / Designated Use	Maximum Reported Daily Value	No. of Samples	Estimated Maximum Value	RP Determination	Proposed Monitoring Requirement/ Rationale (1)
Selenium	**Outfall 001 – TMDL WLAs** Avg. Monthly Limit – 3 µg/L Daily Max limit – 5 µg/L **Outfall 002** 20 µg/L / AgI	3 µg/L	23	6.6 µg/L	**Outfall 001** NA – WLAs Set **Outfall 002** No RP	Monitoring required and the TMDL WLAs are set for outfall 001. Monitoring required for effluent characterization for outfall 002.
Zinc	10,000 µg/L/ AgI	96.2 µg/L	12	269 µg/L	No RP	Monitoring required for effluent characterization.

Footnotes:

(1) The monitoring frequencies are as specified in the permit.

VIII. NARRATIVE WATER QUALITY STANDARDS

All narrative limitations in A.A.C. R18-11-108 that are applicable to the receiving water are included in Part I, Sections C and D of the draft permit.

IX. MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS (Part II of Permit)

Section 308 of the Clean Water Act and 40 CFR Part 122.44(i) require that monitoring be included in permits to determine compliance with effluent limitations. Additionally, monitoring may be required to gather data for future effluent limitations or to monitor effluent impacts on receiving water quality.

Monitoring frequencies are based on the nature and effect of the pollutant, as well as a determination of the minimum sampling necessary to adequately monitor the facility's performance. Monitoring frequencies for some parameters may be reduced in second term permits if all monitoring requirements have been met and the limits or ALs for those parameters have not been exceeded during the first permit term.

For the purposes of this permit, a "24-hour composite" sample has been defined as a flow-proportioned mixture of not less than three discrete samples (aliquots) obtained at equal time intervals over a 24-hour period. The volume of each aliquot shall be directly proportional to the discharge flow rate at the time of sampling.

These criteria for composite sampling are included in order to obtain samples that are representative of the discharge given the potential variability in the duration, frequency and magnitude of discharges from this facility.

Discrete (i.e., grab) samples are specified in the permit for parameters that for varying reasons are not amenable to compositing.

Monitoring locations are specified in the permit (Part I.A and Part I.E) in order to ensure that representative samples of the influent and effluent are consistently obtained.

The requirements in the permit pertaining to Part II, Monitoring and Reporting, are included to ensure that the monitoring data submitted under this permit is accurate in accordance with 40 CFR 122.41(e). The permittee has the responsibility to determine that all data collected for purposes of this permit meet the requirements specified in this permit and is collected, analyzed, and properly reported to ADEQ.

The permit (Part II.A.2) requires the permittee to keep a Quality Assurance (QA) manual at the facility, describing sample collection and analysis processes; the required elements of the QA manual are outlined.

Reporting requirements for monitoring results are detailed in Part II, Sections B.1 and 2 of the permit, including completion and submittal of Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMRs), and AZPDES Flow Record forms. The permittee is responsible for conducting all required monitoring and reporting the results to ADEQ on DMRs or as otherwise specified in the permit.

Electronic reporting. The US EPA has published a final regulation that requires electronic reporting and sharing of Clean Water Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program information instead of the current paper-based reporting (Federal Register, Vol. 80, No. 204, October 22, 2015). Beginning December 21, 2016 (one year after the effective date of the regulation), the Federal rule requires permittees to make electronic submittals of any monitoring reports and forms called for in their permits. ADEQ has created an online portal called myDEQ that allows users to submit their discharge monitoring reports and other applicable reports required in the permit.

Requirements for retention of monitoring records are detailed in Part II.D of the permit.

X. BIOSOLIDS REQUIREMENTS (Part III in Permit)

Standard requirements for the monitoring, reporting, record keeping, and handling of biosolids, as well as minimum treatment requirements for biosolids according to 40 CFR Part 503 are incorporated in the draft permit.

XI. SPECIAL CONDITIONS (Part V in Permit

Pretreatment

Standard requirements for implementing and enforcing an approved pretreatment plan are included in the draft permit. The city of Buckeye operates multiple wastewater treatment facilities with a combined design flow greater than five (5) mgd.

Operation

This permit condition requires the permittee to ensure that the WWTP has an operator who is certified at the appropriate level for the facility, in accordance with A.A.C. R18-5-104 through -114. The required certification level for the WWTP operator is based on the class (Wastewater Treatment Plant) and grade of the facility, which is determined by population served, level of treatment, and other factors.

Permit Reopener

This permit may be modified based on newly available information; to add conditions or limits to address demonstrated effluent toxicity; to implement any EPA-approved new Arizona water quality standard; or to re-evaluate reasonable potential (RP), if assessment levels in this permit are exceeded [A.A.C. R18-9-B906 and 40 CFR Part 122.62 (a) and (b)].

XII. ANTIDEGRADATION

Antidegradation rules have been established under A.A.C. R18-11-107 to ensure that existing surface water quality is maintained and protected. The discharge from the Sundance WRF will be to a canal which is subject to Tier 1 antidegradation protection. Effluent quality limitations and monitoring requirements have been established under the proposed permit to ensure that the discharge will meet the applicable water quality standards. As long as the permittee maintains consistent compliance with these provisions, the designated uses of the receiving water will be presumed protected, and the facility will be deemed to meet currently applicable antidegradation requirements under A.A.C. R18-11-107.

XIII. STANDARD CONDITIONS

Conditions applicable to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 CFR, Part 122 are attached as an appendix to this permit.

XIV. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Public Notice (A.A.C. R18-9-A907)

The public notice is the vehicle for informing all interested parties and members of the general public of the contents of a draft AZPDES permit or other significant action with respect to an AZPDES permit or application. The basic intent of this requirement is to ensure that all interested parties have an opportunity to comment on significant actions of the permitting agency with respect to a permit application or permit. This permit will be public noticed in a local newspaper after a pre-notice review by the applicant and other affected agencies.

Public Comment Period (A.A.C. R18-9-A908)

Rules require that permits be public noticed in a newspaper of general circulation within the area affected by the facility or activity and provide a minimum of 30 calendar days for interested parties to respond in writing to ADEQ. After the closing of the public comment period, ADEQ is required to respond to all significant comments at the time a final permit decision is reached or at the same time a final permit is actually issued.

Public Hearing (A.A.C R18-9-A908(B))

A public hearing may be requested in writing by any interested party. The request should state the nature of the issues proposed to be raised during the hearing. A public hearing will be held if the Director determines there is a significant amount of interest expressed during the 30-day public comment period, or if significant new issues arise that were not considered during the permitting process.

EPA Review (A.A.C. R18-9-A908(C))

A copy of this draft permit and any revisions made to this draft as a result of public comments received will be sent to EPA Region 9 for review. If EPA objects to a provision of the draft, ADEQ will not issue the permit until the objection is resolved.

XV. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Additional information relating to this proposed permit may be obtained from:

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Water Quality Division – AZPDES Individual Permits Unit
Attn: Swathi Kasanneni
1110 West Washington Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Or by contacting Swathi Kasanneni at (602) 771 – 4577 or by e-mail at sk5@azdeq.gov.

XVI. INFORMATION SOURCES

While developing effluent limitations, monitoring requirements, and special conditions for the draft permit, the following information sources were used:

1. AZPDES Permit Application Form(s) 2A and 2S, received August 28, 2018, along with supporting data, facility diagram, and maps submitted by the applicant with the application forms.

2. ADEQ files on Sundance Water Reclamation Facility (WRF)

3. The Gila River – Centennial Wash to Gillespie Dam TMDLS for total Boron and total Selenium became effective on December 23, 2015.

4. ADEQ Geographic Information System (GIS) Web site

5. Arizona Administrative Code (AAC) Title 18, Chapter 11, Article 1, *Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters,* adopted December 31, 2016.

6. A.A.C. Title 18, Chapter 9, Article 9. *Arizona Pollutant Discharge Elimination System* rules.

7. Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 40:
   Part 122, *EPA Administered Permit Programs: The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.*
   Part 124, *Procedures for Decision Making*.
   Part 133. *Secondary Treatment Regulation.*
   Part 503. *Standards for the Use or Disposal of Sewage Sludge*.

8. EPA Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control dated March 1991.

9. *Regions 9 & 10 Guidance for Implementing Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Programs*, US EPA, May 31, 1996.

10. U.S. EPA NPDES Permit Writers' Manual, September 2010.